

**FERGUSON LAW PC**

1816 FIFTH STREET, BERKELEY, CA • (510) 548-9005 • SAM@FERGUSONLAWPC.COM

October 20, 2025

**Via CM/ECF:**

Hon. Judge Gonzalez Rogers  
Courtroom 1 – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1301 Clay Street  
Oakland, CA 94612

Re: *In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability  
Litigation*, 4:22-md-03047

Dear Hon. Judge Gonzalez Rogers,

In TIME USA, LLC’s reply brief in support of its motion to intervene, TIME noted that Defendants “appear to have completely failed to comply with the Court’s sealing protocol with respect to their six motions for summary judgment against the school district bellwether plaintiffs: there is no evidence related to Defendants’ motions for summary judgment on the docket at the moment, sealed or otherwise.” Dkt. 2309 at 3:6–9. TIME further noted that it understood “that the evidence was served on Plaintiffs,” and that it did “not know why it was not filed.” *Id.* at 3:28, n.2. TIME understood that Defendants’ summary judgment evidence should have been filed on the master docket based on the Court’s standing order that “[a]ll documents shall be e-filed in the Master file, No. 22-md-03047.” Dkt. 2 at 5:17–19. However, after TIME filed its reply brief, counsel for the Defendants alerted the undersigned that evidence and Temporary Sealing Motions related to the Defendants’ motions for summary judgment were filed on the individual case dockets. Defense counsel represented that it had advised the Court and Plaintiffs’ liaison counsel via email that it would file evidence in this manner to “avoid burdening the Court and its staff with duplicative, voluminous filings, and with having to resolve identical sealing motions across both dockets.”

TIME files this letter to correct its statement in the reply brief regarding the filing of Defendants’ summary judgment evidence and motions to seal. TIME apologizes for any confusion the reply may have caused the Court. Defendants’ evidence and Temporary Sealing Motions were filed in the bellwether individual cases but not on the master docket.

Further review of the Temporary Sealing Motions on the individual dockets still underscores the need for TIME to intervene. Defendants filed more than half of the exhibits in support of their motions for summary judgment entirely under seal. *See* Dkt. 45 in 4:23-cv-01804; Dkt. 17 in 4:24-cv-01382; Dkt. 24 in 4:23-cv-04659; Dkt. 38 in 4:23-cv-01467; Dkt. 31 in 4:25-cv-02310; Dkt. 25 in 4:23-cv-03065 (reflecting a combined total of 131 out of 253 exhibits filed entirely under seal).

Sincerely,

FERGUSON LAW PC  
/s/ Sam Ferguson  
Sam Ferguson